

**REMARKS**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated April 6, 2005, claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claim 20 has been canceled and claim 21 has been added to the application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

Claims 3 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 3 has been amended to recite "the transmitter controller" which corresponds to the wording of claim 1. Claim 11 has been amended to recite "transmitter controller", also to correspond to the wording of claim 1. Applicants respectfully believe that these rejections have been overcome.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Rohrberg* (6, 661,350).

Applicants have amended claim 1 and respectfully believe that this rejection has been overcome.

Claim 1 has been amended to include a push button that is coupled to the security module and a memory having a memory code. The transmitter controller is coupled to the push button and the memory. The transmitter controller disables the operation of the push button until the first coded signal matches the memory code. When the first coded signal matches the memory code the push button is enabled and the transmitter controller generates a wireless control signal for operating the remote device in response to activating the push button. Thus, the push button is not enabled until such a code matches the memory. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the push button may be a garage door opener. Thus, as mentioned in the present application, the garage door opener would not be enabled unless the code has been entered. Applicants respectfully submit that this is not taught or suggested in the *Rohrberg* reference. Later, the Examiner rejected disabling in response to the *Geschke* reference. Applicants have reviewed Col. 3, line 61 through Col. 4, line 10, of the *Geschke* reference. The *Geschke* reference merely refers to disabling a theft detection system and not push buttons. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the combination is not suggested in either the *Geschke* reference nor the *Rohrberg* reference.

Likewise, claims 2, 4-5, and 17-18 are also believed to be allowable for the same

reasons set forth above. Claim 17 describes a disable code which, as mentioned above, is not taught or suggested. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of independent claim 17.

Claims 3 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rohrberg* in further view of *Flick* (6,392,534).

Claim 3 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above. The *Flick* reference also does not teach or suggest the disabling of a code. The *Flick* reference is merely cited to teach a bus. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claim 3.

Claim 11 is dependent upon claim 1 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

Claim 12 is an independent claim that has also been amended to include the disable code. The transmitter controller has an enabled state and a disabled state. The enabling logic changes the enable state to a disable state in response to the disable code and changing the disable state to an enable state in response to the disable code. Using the same code to enable and disable is one feature of this claim. Such features are set forth in steps 82-90 of the present application.

Claims 6 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rohrberg* in view of *McMahon* (5,663,650).

Claims 6 and 19 depend from independent claims 1 and 17, respectively. Both claims 1 and 17 have been amended and Applicants therefore respectfully submit that neither the *Rohrberg* reference nor the *McMahon* reference teach the missing elements as described above. Applicants therefore respectfully believe that these claims are allowable.

Claims 7-10 and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rohrberg* in view of *Losey* (6,606,492).

Claims 7-10 depend from claim 1, and claims 13-16 depend from claim 12. Applicants respectfully believe that the amended independent claims now overcome this rejection since neither the *Rohrberg* reference nor the *Losey* reference teach or suggest the elements set forth above.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rohrberg* in view of *Geschke*.


As mentioned above, claim 20 has been canceled. The *Geschke* reference, however, does not teach or suggest enabling or disabling a push button using a disable

signal.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all objections are now overcome. Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin G. Mierzwa  
Reg. No. 38,049  
28333 Telegraph Road  
Suite 250  
Southfield, MI 48034  
(248) 223-9500

Date: 6-30-2005